

* * * For callouses apply night and morning until callous starts to peel. (In about three to five days.) In treatment of * * * Ringworm infection (Barber's Itch) apply Quadine freely to affected areas," were statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, and were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

The article was alleged to be misbranded also in violation of the Insecticide Act of 1910, as set forth in notice of judgment No. 1631 published under that act.

On April 18, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

28991. Adulteration and misbranding of turpentine. U. S. v. Frank F. Lefkoff (Authorized Brands). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 39491. Sample Nos. 13394-C, 15892-C, 16195-C.)

This product was represented to be pure gum spirits of turpentine but consisted of steamed-distilled wood turpentine.

On June 19, 1937, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Frank F. Lefkoff, trading under the name of Authorized Brands, at Atlanta, Ga., alleging shipment by said defendant on or about July 29 and October 13 and 30, 1936, from the State of Georgia into the States of Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina, of quantities of alleged pure gum spirits of turpentine which was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Authorized Brand Pure Gum Spirits Turpentine * * * Packed and Guaranteed by Authorized Brands, Atlanta, Ga."

It was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, i. e., spirits of turpentine, but differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity of spirits of turpentine as determined by the test laid down in said pharmacopoeia official at the time of investigation; that the said standard specified that spirits of turpentine should be "the volatile oil distilled from the oleoresin obtained from *Pinus palustris* Miller and other species of *Pinus* (Fam. Pinaceae) which yield exclusively turpene oils"; and that it was not such product but was steamed-distilled wood turpentine obtained in whole or in part by steam distillation of pine wood.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Pure Gum Spirits Turpentine," borne on the bottles, was false and misleading since it represented that the article was gum spirits of turpentine; whereas it was not gum spirits of turpentine but was steam-distilled wood turpentine. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the name of another article, gum spirits of turpentine.

On October 2, 1937, a plea of guilty having been entered by the defendant, the court imposed a fine of \$25.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

28992. Misbranding of valium. U. S. v. 25 Bottles of Valium. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 41904. Sample No. 13911-D.)

This product was misbranded because of false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims in its labeling. It was misbranded further because it was represented as complying with all laws, including all food and drug laws; whereas it did not comply with the Federal Food and Drugs Act.

On March 8, 1938, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 bottles of Valium at Portland, Maine, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 20 and December 7, 1937, from Waltham, Mass., by Clematis Laboratories, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of tablets containing calcium sulphide with a red sugar coating.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that statements contained in a circular within the package, on the carton, and on the bottle label falsely and fraudulently represented its curative and therapeutic effectiveness in the treatment of varicose veins, varicose ulcers, and hemorrhoids (piles). It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements appearing